

NON-GAUSSIAN HALO BIAS AND FUTURE GALAXY SURVEYS

CARMELITA CARBONE¹, LICIA VERDE^{1,2,3} AND SABINO MATARRESE⁴*Draft version June 12, 2008*

ABSTRACT

We forecast constraints on primordial non-Gaussianity achievable from forthcoming surveys by exploiting the scale-dependent halo bias introduced on large scales by non-Gaussian initial conditions. We explore the performance of exploiting both the shape of the galaxy power-spectrum on large scales and the cross-correlation of galaxies with Cosmic Microwave Background maps through the Integrated Sachs Wolfe effect. We find that future surveys can detect primordial non-Gaussianity of the local form with a non-Gaussianity parameter $|f_{\text{NL}}|$ of order unity. This is particularly exciting because, while the simplest single-field slow-roll models of inflation predict a primordial $|f_{\text{NL}}| \ll 1$, this signal sources extra contributions to the effective f_{NL} of large-scale structures that are expected to be above our predicted detection threshold.

Subject headings: cosmology: theory, large-scale structure of universe – galaxies: clusters: general – galaxies: halos

1. INTRODUCTION

Tests of deviation from Gaussian initial conditions offer an important window into the very early universe and a powerful test for the mechanism which generated primordial perturbations.

While standard single-field models of slow-roll inflation lead to small departures from Gaussianity, non-standard scenarios allow for a larger level of non-Gaussianity (see, e.g., Bartolo et al. (2004) and references therein).

The standard observables to constrain non-Gaussianity are the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) and the Large-Scale Structure (LSS) of the universe. Traditionally, the most popular method to detect primordial non-Gaussianity (NG) has been to measure the bispectrum or the three-point function of the CMB (Verde et al. 2000; Komatsu et al. 2005; Yadav & Wandelt 2008), as the LSS bispectrum is sensitive to primordial NG only at high redshift (Verde et al. 2000; Scoccimarro et al. 2004; Sefusatti & Komatsu 2007; Cooray 2006; Pillepich et al. 2007).

A powerful technique is based on the abundance (Matarrese et al. 2000; Verde et al. 2001; LoVerde et al. 2007; Robinson & Baker 2000; Robinson et al. 2000) and clustering (Grinstein & Wise 1986; Matarrese et al. 1986; Lucchin et al. 1988) of rare events such as dark matter density peaks, as they trace the tail of the underlying distribution. These theoretical predictions have been tested against numerical N-body simulations (Kang et al. 2007; Grossi et al. 2007; Dalal et al. 2007).

Dalal et al. (2007); Matarrese & Verde (2008) showed that primordial NG affects the clustering of dark matter halos inducing a scale-dependent large-scale bias. Here we argue that this effect could be used to constrain NG through the Integrated Sachs Wolfe (ISW)

effect (Sachs & Wolfe 1967) and through the shape of the galaxy power-spectrum on large scales. We forecast how future galaxy surveys could constrain Gaussianity via this “halo-bias” effect. We find that constraints from surveys which provide a large sample of galaxies or galaxy clusters over a volume comparable to the horizon size (e.g., DES, PanSTARRS, LSST, EUCLID, ADEPT) are competitive with CMB bispectrum constraints achievable with an ideal CMB experiment. In particular, Bartolo et al. (2005) showed that even when the primordial f_{NL} is tiny, the evolution of perturbations on super-Hubble scales, yields extra contributions to the effective f_{NL} relevant for the LSS, which are configuration and redshift dependent. These contributions are of amplitude comparable to the forecasted errors and can therefore no longer be neglected.

Along the way we offer physical insights in the findings of Matarrese & Verde (2008) (hereafter MV08) and explain the connections to the approach of Dalal et al. (2007); we show that only the formalism of MV08 can be used to correctly handle the non-linear contributions to the primordial NG.

2. NON-GAUSSIAN HALO BIAS IN CONTEXT

Matarrese & Verde (2008) generalized to NG initial conditions results and techniques developed in the 80s (Grinstein & Wise 1986; Matarrese et al. 1986; Lucchin et al. 1988) to relate the clustering properties of the collapsed structures (halos) to those of the underlying dark matter distribution for Gaussian initial conditions. This approach, which we briefly review here, yields an analytic expression for the bias of dark matter halos for non-local and scale-dependent NG models in which the primordial bispectrum of the potential is the dominant higher-order correlation and has a general form. The starting point of MV08 is to consider the expression for the correlation function of regions above a high threshold in the general NG case, which has the form (Grinstein & Wise 1986; Matarrese et al. 1986; Lucchin et al. 1988):

$$\xi_{h,M}(r) = -1 + \exp[X(r)] \quad (1)$$

¹ Institute of Space Sciences (CSIC-IEEC), UAB, Barcelona 08193, Spain; carbone@ieec.uab.es

² ICREA; verde@ieec.uab.es

³ Dep. Astrophysical Sciences, Princeton University, Ivy Lane, Princeton, USA

⁴ Dipartimento di Fisica “G. Galilei”, Università degli Studi di Padova and INFN, Sezione di Padova, via Marzolo 8, 35131, Padova, Italy; sabino.matarrese@pd.infn.it

where X is a complicated expression that depends on all the n -point correlations of the underlying density field filtered on the mass-scale M , as well as on the threshold height (see MV08 for details). Then, one interprets the region above high thresholds as halos, and, for large separations r (small values of X), expands the exponential to first order and considers only terms up to the three-point correlation function. Finally, one Fourier transforms to obtain an approximated expression for the power-spectrum of halos in NG models. For NG of the type (Salopek & Bond 1990; Gangui et al. 1994; Verde et al. 2000; Komatsu & Spergel 2001)

$$\Phi = \phi + f_{\text{NL}} (\phi^2 - \langle \phi^2 \rangle) , \quad (2)$$

where Φ denotes Bardeen's gauge-invariant potential⁵ and ϕ denotes a Gaussian random field, the halo power-spectrum has the form

$$P_h(k, z) = \frac{\delta_c^2(z) P_{\delta\delta}(k, z)}{\sigma_M^4 D^2(z)} [1 + 4f_{\text{NL}} \delta_c(z) \alpha(k)] . \quad (3)$$

Here $\alpha(k)$ is the quantity in Fig. 3 of MV08, which is $\propto 1/k^2$ at large scales; σ_M^2 is the mass variance linearly extrapolated to $z = 0$; $\delta_c(z) = \Delta_c(z)/D(z)$, with $\Delta_c(z)$ the linear overdensity for spherical collapse (which weakly depends on z in non-Einstein de Sitter cosmologies), and $D(z)$ linear growth-factor of density fluctuations normalized to unity at $z = 0$.

The Lagrangian bias b_L of the halos (all correlations and peaks considered here are those of the *initial* density field, linearly extrapolated till the present time) is then $b_{L,h}(z, M) \simeq b_{L,h}^G(z, M)[1 + 2f_{\text{NL}} \delta_c(z) \alpha(k)]$, with $b_{L,h}^G(z, M) \simeq \delta_c(z)/(\sigma_M^2 D(z))$. Making the standard assumption that halos move coherently with the underlying dark matter, one obtains the final Eulerian bias as $b_E = 1 + b_L$, so that

$$b_h^{\text{fNL}} = 1 + \frac{\delta_c(z_f)}{\sigma_M^2 D(z_o)} [1 + 2f_{\text{NL}} \delta_c(z_f) \alpha(k)] , \quad (4)$$

where, following the approach of Catelan et al. (1998), we have made explicit the dependence on both the halo formation redshift z_f and the observation redshift z_o . This expression for the NG bias of halos of mass M is scale-dependent and increases rapidly at large scales. The approach of identifying peaks with halos is valid for rare (massive) halos. Indeed, the above expression for the Gaussian Lagrangian halo bias is approximate; a more accurate expression is (Efsthathiou et al. 1988; Cole & Kaiser 1989; Mo & White 1996)

$$b_{L,h}^G(z_o, M, z_f) = \frac{1}{D(z_o)} \left[\frac{\delta_c(z_f)}{\sigma_M^2} - \frac{1}{\delta_c(z_f)} \right] . \quad (5)$$

In addition, and as discussed below, this expression can be further refined with the help of N-body simulations. For objects that did not undergo recent mergers, $z_f \gg z_o$, the bias is well approximated by Eq. (4). Eq. (4) however also applies to the case $z_f \approx z_o$ (rapid mergers)

⁵ On sub-Hubble scales, Bardeen's gauge-invariant potential Φ reduces to the usual Newtonian peculiar gravitational potential, up to a minus sign. In the literature, there are two conventions for Eq. (2): the LSS and the CMB one. Following the LSS convention, here Φ is linearly extrapolated at $z = 0$. In the CMB convention Φ is instead primordial: thus $f_{\text{NL}} = (g(z = \infty)/g(0))f_{\text{NL}}^{\text{CMB}}$.

for $\delta_c^2 \gg \sigma_M^2$, i.e. large masses and/or high formation redshifts.

Note that Eq. (4) can be rewritten as $b_{L,h}^{\text{fNL}} = b_{L,h}^G + \Delta b$, where

$$\Delta b = 2f_{\text{NL}} \delta_c(z_f) (b_h^G(z_o, M, z_f) - 1) \alpha(k) . \quad (6)$$

One may note that for f_{NL} large and negative, Eq. (3) would formally yield b_h^{fNL} and $P_h(k)$ negative on large enough scales. This is a manifestation of the breakdown of the approximations made: a) all correlations of higher order than the bispectrum were neglected: for large NG this truncation may not hold; b) The exponential in Eq. (1) was expanded to linear order. This however could be easily corrected for, remembering that the $P(k)$ obtained in Eq. (3) is in reality the Fourier transform of X , the argument of the exponential. One would then compute the halo correlation function using Eq. (1) and Fourier transforming back to obtain the halo power-spectrum.

Dalal et al. (2007) and Slosar et al. (2008) use the peak-background formalism to obtain an equation similar to Eq. (4). In particular, while Dalal et al. (2007) relies on the spherical collapse model (and thus on the standard Press-Schechter (Press & Schechter 1974) approach), Slosar et al. (2008) extend and reformulate it so that it relies on the extended Press-Schechter approach and on the universality of the mass function, and can be obtained for any mass function, even one that is a fit to N-body simulations. The advantage of their formulation over that of Dalal et al. (2007) is that they can include the description of the effect of halo mergers. The effect of halo merger can be analytically described only for the standard Press-Schechter mass function, but they argue that the scaling of the correction for mergers could be calibrated from N-body simulations.

We note here that their derivation can *only* be carried out for NG of the local type. On the other hand, the formulation of MV08 is more general: the extended Press-Schechter approach, halo mergers and mass functions that are better fit to N-body simulations than the standard Press-Schechter can be readily taken into account by substituting $b_{L,h}^G$ in Eq. (5) by the peak-background split bias which is obtained as $b_{L,h}^G = -n^{-1} \partial n / \partial \delta_c$, where n denotes the halo mass function for Gaussian initial conditions, which could be given e.g. by the Sheth & Tormen (1999) formula or by a fit to simulations.

In particular, Eq. (5) is replaced by

$$b_{L,h}^G(z_o, M, z_f) = \frac{1}{D(z_o)} \left[\frac{q \delta_c(z_f)}{\sigma_M^2} - \frac{1}{\delta_c(z_f)} \right] + \frac{2p}{\delta_c(z_f) D(z_o)} \left[1 + \left(\frac{q \delta_c^2(z_f)}{\sigma_M^2} \right)^p \right]^{-1} . \quad (7)$$

The parameters q and p account for non-spherical collapse and fit to numerical simulations yield $q \sim 0.75$, $p = 0.3$ (Sheth & Tormen 1999; Sheth et al. 2001). The correction for non-spherical collapse also applies to the NG correction to the halo bias:

$$\Delta b = 2q' f_{\text{NL}} \delta_c(b_h^G - 1) \alpha(k) . \quad (8)$$

where q' can be calibrated to N-body simulations and is found to be $q' \approx 0.8$ (Grossi et al. 2008). We stress here

that it is particularly important to be able to account for general non-local and scale-dependent NG characterized by a given bispectrum of the potential. Indeed, as shown by Bartolo et al. (2005), there are extra contributions to the bispectrum that come in at the same level as the primordial signal: in other words the primordial contribution is enhanced for LSS, yielding configuration and redshift dependent contributions to the *effective* f_{NL} which cannot be neglected. Note that the NG bias formula of MV08 is fully general and can easily account for non-constant f_{NL} .

3. METHOD

Before we present the forecasts we need to make two considerations.

Halos vs Galaxies: The theory developed in MV08 and above describes the clustering properties of halos, but we observe galaxies. Different galaxy populations occupy dark matter halos following different prescriptions. If we think in the halo-model (Cooray & Sheth 2002; Scoccimarro et al. 2001; Peacock & Smith 2000; Smith et al. 2003) framework, at very large scales (as those relevant for this analysis), only the “two-halo” contribution matters and the details of the halo occupation distribution of galaxies (the so-called “one-halo” term) is unimportant. In particular, the galaxy population known as “luminous red galaxies” (LRG), is known to be old and free from recent merger activity. For this population, the modeling of MV08 should offer a good description. Emission lines galaxies on the other hand may be affected by recent merger activity and so their b_h^G may need to be modified, as described in §2. As we discuss below, with this modification, the effect of uncertainties in the Gaussian bias enters in our estimates only through the shot-noise contribution to the signal-to-noise ratio.

Detection vs Measurement: Before we present the forecasts we need to make an important distinction between “detection” and “measurement”. To compute the statistical significance of a detection we need to compute the significance of deviations from the null hypothesis: in particular, the fiducial model used in the calculation has $f_{\text{NL}} = 0$ and the error bars are also computed assuming the null hypothesis $f_{\text{NL}} = 0$. However to carry out a measurement of $f_{\text{NL}} \neq 0$, the theoretical model and the error bars must be computed as functions of f_{NL} . Here we will report forecasts for *detection* of f_{NL} .

We consider two probes: the large-scale power-spectrum of galaxies and the ISW effect. In both cases, since we will consider tracers of rare halos, we will assume $z_f = z_o$, yielding a possibly conservative estimate of the errors on f_{NL} .

3.1. Forecasts from the shape of the large-scale power-spectrum

In the Fisher matrix approach to error forecasts we can write

$$\ln \mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{(\Delta P(k))^2}{\sigma_P^2} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{(P(k)4\delta_c(z)\alpha(k)f_{\text{NL}})^2}{\sigma_P^2} \quad (9)$$

where we have assumed a Gaussian likelihood⁶. An estimate of the error in f_{NL} , $\sigma_{f_{\text{NL}}}(k)$, at a given k is given by

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{f_{\text{NL}}}(k)^2} = \frac{\partial^2 |\ln \mathcal{L}|}{\partial f_{\text{NL}}^2} = \frac{16P^2 \alpha(k)^2 \delta_c^2}{\sigma_P^2} \quad (10)$$

The relative error in P for a shell in k -space of width Δk and for a survey with effective volume V_{eff} is

$$\left(\frac{\sigma_P}{P}\right)^2 = \frac{2}{4\pi k^2 \Delta k V_{\text{eff}} / (2\pi^3)}, \quad (11)$$

where $V_{\text{eff}} = V(1 + 1/(\bar{n}P))$, with V the survey volume, and $\bar{n}$ the average density of galaxies. If shot-noise is sub-dominant (i.e. $\bar{n}P \gg 1$) $V_{\text{eff}} = V$.

The total error from a k -range from k_{min} to k_{max} is:

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{f_{\text{NL}}}^2} = \frac{8}{2\pi^2} \frac{\Delta_c(z)^2}{D(z)^2} V_{\text{eff}} \int_{k_{\text{min}}}^{k_{\text{max}}} \alpha(k)^2 k^2 dk. \quad (12)$$

If we divide the survey in redshift slices centered around z_i then the errors obtained combining different redshift slices (if uncorrelated) is

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{f_{\text{NL}}}^2} = \sum_i \frac{1}{\sigma_{f_{\text{NL}}}(z_i)^2}. \quad (13)$$

We set k_{max} to be $0.03 h/\text{Mpc}$ and k_{min} to be greater than the $2\pi/V^{1/3}$ where V is the volume of the shell considered ($\Delta z = 0.1$). Note that the effect of NG alters the broad-band behavior of the $P(k)$ on very large scales, which is not affected by the precision with which the radial positions of the galaxies in measure. Thus, we can treat photometric and spectroscopic surveys on the same footing. The requirement of surveying a large volume of the universe and sampling highly biased galaxies to beat shot-noise, which is a key point for BAO surveys is also a bonus for constraining primordial NG. In particular, for the k_{min} we use we find that $P_g(k_{\text{min}}) \simeq P_g(k = 0.2h/\text{Mpc})$, thus the shot-noise requirement for BAO surveys of $\bar{n}P(k = 0.2h/\text{Mpc}) > 1$ implies that for all scales of interest here $\bar{n}P \gg 1$. We have checked that our results do not change if we impose $\bar{n}P \sim 3$.

While for BAO surveys measuring redshift accurately is crucial (Seo & Eisenstein 2003; Blake & Bridle 2005), for this application is not important.

3.2. Forecasts from the Integrated Sachs Wolfe effect

The ISW effect probes the largest cosmological scales. As the NG effect goes $\propto 1/k^2$ on large scales, this is a promising probe of NG. Here we follow Afshordi (2004) to quantify the significance of a detection of f_{NL} through the estimate of the cross-correlation between the ISW effect with LRG galaxy distribution. For a galaxy survey with the average comoving density distribution $n_c(r)$ as a function of the comoving distance r , in the Limber approximation, the expected cross-correlation in the spherical harmonic space, can be written as

$$C_{gT}(\ell) = \frac{2T}{\int dr r^2 n_c(r)} \int dr n_c(r) P_{\Phi',g}(k), \quad (14)$$

⁶ While strictly speaking the distribution of $P(k)$ is non-Gaussian, this is a standard assumption in Fisher based approaches.

TABLE 1
GALAXY SURVEYS CONSIDERED

survey	z range	sq deg	mean galaxy density (h/Mpc) ³	$\Delta f_{\text{NL}}/q'$ LSS
SDSS LRG's	$0.16 < z < 0.47$	7.6×10^3	1.36×10^{-4}	40
BOSS	$0 < z < 0.7$	10^4	2.66×10^{-4}	18
WF MOS low z	$0.5 < z < 1.3$	2×10^3	4.88×10^{-4}	15
WF MOS high z	$2.3 < z < 3.3$	3×10^2	4.55×10^{-4}	17
ADEPT	$1 < z < 2$	2.8×10^4	9.37×10^{-4}	1.5
EUCLID	$0 < z < 2$	2×10^4	1.56×10^{-3}	1.7
DES	$0.2 < z < 1.3$	5×10^3	1.85×10^{-3}	8
PanSTARRS	$0 < z < 1.2$	3×10^4	1.72×10^{-3}	3.5
LSST	$0.3 < z < 3.6$	3×10^4	2.77×10^{-3}	0.7

where $k = (\ell + 1/2)/r$, Φ' is the derivative of the gravitational potential with respect to the conformal time, and $\delta_{g,\ell m}^{2D}$ and $T_{\ell m}$ are the projected survey galaxy overdensity and the CMB temperature in the spherical harmonic space, respectively.

The expected dispersion in the cross-correlation signal is $\Delta C_{gT}^2(\ell) \simeq C_{gg}(\ell)C_{TT}(\ell)[f_{\text{sky}}(2\ell + 1)]^{-1}$, where f_{sky} is the fraction of sky covered in the survey, and we assumed a small cross-correlation signal, i.e. $C_{gT}^2(\ell) \ll C_{gg}(\ell)C_{TT}(\ell)$.

For a galaxy distribution biased according to Eq. (4), dividing the survey in redshift shells, and following the same procedure of Section 3, the error in each shell at redshift z for a given ℓ is

$$\sigma_{f_{\text{NL}}}^{-2} = \frac{\gamma [H(z)D(z)\frac{d}{dz}((1+z)D(z))P_{\delta\delta}(k,0)\Delta b(k,z)]^2 r^2 \delta r}{(2\ell + 1)^3 C_{TT}(\ell)[P_G(k,z) + n_c(r)^{-1}]}, \quad (15)$$

where $\gamma = 8f_{\text{sky}}(3TH_0^2\Omega_{m0}/c^3)^2$, $k \equiv (l + 1/2)/r$, $\delta r = (c/H(z))\Delta z$, Δb is Eq. (6) in the limit $f_{\text{NL}} = 1$, and P_G denotes the galaxy power spectrum in the Gaussian case. We impose k_{min} to be greater than the largest mode that can be sampled in each survey shell and $k_{\text{max}} = 0.03 h/\text{Mpc}$. The total error is obtained summing up Eq. (15) on all the multipoles $\ell \leq 200$ and integrating over the minimum and maximum redshift of each survey.

For future large-scale galaxy surveys, we obtain $\Delta f_{\text{NL}} = 7.6, 12.5, 11.5$ for LSST, EUCLID and ADEPT, respectively.

4. RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Here we present forecasts of f_{NL} constraints for forthcoming and future surveys. The surveys we consider and their specifications are reported in Table 1, along with the $1 - \sigma$ error on f_{NL} from the shape of the galaxy power-spectrum. The reported errors on f_{NL} have been normalized by the correction factor for non-spherical collapse $q' \approx 0.8$. Note that the number of galaxies and the Gaussian bias enter in this signal-to-noise calculation only through the contribution to the error due to shot-noise. The reported numbers are not dominated by shot-noise.

This signal-to-noise calculation indicates that the halo

clustering approach to primordial NG is in principle more promising than the ISW one: the ISW signal is weighted at low redshift ($z \lesssim 1$), when dark energy dominates, while the effect of NG grows with redshift. However, the two approaches are affected by different systematics and thus should be considered complementary.

It is interesting to compare the constraints on primordial NG achievable from the large-scale halo clustering with those achievable with the small-scale galaxy bispectrum. For example, comparing with Sefusatti & Komatsu (2007) we deduce that the halo-clustering constraints are a factor of 3 stronger than the bispectrum ones. The bispectrum however, through its dependence on the k -space configuration, can be used to discriminate among different forms of NG. The CMB bispectrum for an ideal experiment can yield constraints of $\Delta f_{\text{NL}} = \text{few}$ (Yadav et al. 2007). The results of Table 1 indicate that constraints on f_{NL} of order unity are achievable with future surveys, making it a highly competitive technique. We conclude that it is particularly important to be able to take into account general non-local and scale-dependent NG features characterized by a given bispectrum of the potential. In fact, as shown by Bartolo et al. (2005), there are contributions to the bispectrum, which have a specific shape and redshift dependence and which come into play at the level of $f_{\text{NL}} \sim \text{few}$. This is well above the detection threshold for forthcoming and proposed surveys, thus opening up the possibility to measure these secondary contributions to f_{NL} .

While this work was being completed we became aware of Afshordi & Tolley (arXiv:0806.1061) and of McDonald (arXiv:0806.1046). Our results are in good agreement with theirs.

Acknowledgments: CC is supported through a Beatrix de Pinos grant. LV is supported by FP7-PEOPLE-2007-4-3-IRG n. 202182 and CSIC I3 grant n. 200750I034. LV thanks W. Hu, M. Grossi and E. Branchini for fruitful discussions. SM acknowledges partial support by ASI contract I/016/07/0 "COFIS" and ASI contract Planck LFI Activity of Phase E2.

REFERENCES

- Afshordi, N. 2004, Phys. Rev. D, 70, 083536
 Bartolo, N., Komatsu, E., Matarrese, S., & Riotto, A. 2004, Phys. Rep., 402, 103
 Bartolo, N., Matarrese, S., & Riotto, A. 2005, Journal of Cosmology and Astro-Particle Physics, 10, 10
 Blake, C., & Bridle, S. 2005, MNRAS, 363, 1329
 Cooray, A., & Sheth, R. 2002, Phys. Rep., 372, 1

- Catelan, P., Lucchin, F., Matarrese, S., & Porciani, C. 1998, *MNRAS*, 297, 692
- Cole, S., Kaiser, N., 1989, *MNRAS*, 231, 1127
- Cooray, A. 2006, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 97, 261301
- Dalal, N., Dore, O., Huterer, D., & Shirokov, A. 2007, preprint, arXiv:0710.4560
- Efstathiou, G., Frenk, C. S., White, S. D. M., Davis, M., 1988, *MNRAS*, 235, 715
- Gangui, A., Lucchin, F., Matarrese, S., & Mollerach, S. 1994, *ApJ*, 430, 447
- Grinstein, B., & Wise, M. B. 1986, *ApJ*, 310, 19
- Grossi, M., Dolag, K., Branchini, E., Matarrese, S., & Moscardini, L. 2007, *MNRAS*, 382, 1261
- Grossi et al., 2008, in preparation
- Kang, X., Norberg, P., & Silk, J. 2007, *MNRAS*, 376, 343
- Komatsu, E., & Spergel, D. N. 2001, *Phys. Rev. D*, 63, 063002
- Komatsu, E., Spergel, D. N., & Wandelt, B. D. 2005, *ApJ*, 634, 14
- LoVerde, M., Miller, A., Shandera, S., & Verde, L. 2007, *ArXiv e-prints*, 711
- Lucchin, F., Matarrese, S., & Vittorio, N. 1988, *ApJ*, 330, L21
- Matarrese, S., Lucchin, F., & Bonometto, S. A. 1986, *ApJLett*, 310, L21
- Matarrese, S., & Verde, L. 2008, *ApJ*, 677, L77 (MV08)
- Matarrese, S., Verde, L., & Jimenez, R. 2000, *ApJ*, 541, 10
- Mo, H. J., & White, S. D. M. 1996, *MNRAS*, 282, 347
- Peacock, J. A., & Smith, R. E. 2000, *MNRAS*, 318, 1144
- Pillepich, A., Porciani, C., & Matarrese, S. 2007, *ApJ*, 662, 1
- Press, W. H., & Schechter, P. 1974, *ApJ*, 187, 425
- Robinson, J., & Baker, J. E. 2000, *MNRAS*, 311, 781
- Robinson, J., Gawiser, E., & Silk, J. 2000, *ApJ*, 532, 1
- Sachs, R. K., & Wolfe, A. M. 1967, *ApJ*, 147, 73
- Salopek, D. S., & Bond, J. R. 1990, *Phys. Rev. D*, 42, 3936
- Scoccimarro, R., Sheth, R. K., Hui, L., & Jain, B. 2001, *ApJ*, 546, 20
- Scoccimarro, R., Sefusatti, E., & Zaldarriaga, M. 2004, *Phys. Rev. D*, 69, 103513
- Sefusatti, E., Vale, C., Kadota, K., Frieman, J. 2007, *ApJ*, 658, 669
- Sefusatti, E., & Komatsu, E. 2007, *Phys. Rev. D*, 76, 083004
- Seo, H.-J., & Eisenstein, D. J. 2003, *ApJ*, 598, 720
- Sheth, R. K., Mo, H. J., & Tormen, G. 2001, *MNRAS*, 323, 1
- Sheth, R. K., & Tormen, G. 1999, *MNRAS*, 308, 119
- Slosar, A., Hirata, C., Seljak, U., Ho, S., & Padmanabhan, N. 2008, *ArXiv e-prints*, 805, arXiv:0805.3580
- Smith, R. E., et al. 2003, *MNRAS*, 341, 1311
- Verde, L., Jimenez, R., Kamionkowski, M., & Matarrese, S. 2001, *MNRAS*, 325, 412
- Verde, L., Wang, L., Heavens, A. F., & Kamionkowski, M. 2000, *MNRAS*, 313, 141
- Yadav, A. P. S., Komatsu, E., & Wandelt, B. D. 2007, *ApJ*, 664, 680
- Yadav, A. P. S., & Wandelt, B. D. 2008, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 100, 181301